

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Interview**

Applicant graciously acknowledges that the Examiner granted an interview with Timothy J. Le Duc on March 19, 2008. Proposed amendments to the claims were discussed. No agreement was reached at that time and further consideration and/or search is required. However, as evidenced by the Examiner's Interview Summary dated March 19, 2008, the Examiner suggested, in the independent claims, changing the "individual tactile sensation pattern" to read as "different tactile sensation force patterns." The Examiner also suggested changing "respective type of display element" to read as "respective types of display elements."

### **2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldenberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,197). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

#### **A. Claims 1-7**

Independent claim 1 as amended recites that "the processing device dynamically generates a tactile sensation control pattern that defines a force pattern associated with all of the display screen elements within the variable screen layout as a function of (1) a data structure that defines different tactile sensation force patterns for each display screen element within the variable screen layout based upon respective types of display elements and (2) an arrangement of the display elements within the variable screen layout, at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device, and stores the dynamically generated tactile sensation control pattern."

Col. 2, lines 35-40 and col. 5, lines 57-67 of Goldenberg et al., relied upon by the

Office Action at page 4, merely disclose a conventional menu having similar menu items that each have the same force pattern. On the other hand, the cited portions of Goldberg et al. do not disclose dynamically generating a tactile sensation control pattern when the display screen data is sent to the display device as a function of (1) a data structure that defines different tactile sensation patterns for each display screen element within the variable screen layout based upon respective type of display element and (2) an arrangement of the display elements within the variable screen layout.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome. Claims 2-7 depend upon independent claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

**B. Claims 8-12**

Independent claim 8 as amended recites “dynamically generating a new tactile sensation control pattern when the variable screen definition data is sent to the display device, the new tactile sensation control pattern being calculated as a function of (1) the variable screen definition data that defines all of the individual display elements to be displayed within the screen layout, and (2) an object attribute table that defines different tactile sensation force patterns for each display element in the screen layout based upon respective types of display elements.”

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Goldenberg et al. does not calculate a new tactile sensation control pattern as a function of (1) the variable screen definition data that defines all of the individual display elements to be displayed within the screen layout, and (2) an object attribute table that defines different tactile sensation force patterns for individual display elements in the screen layout by respective type.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 8 has been overcome. Claims 9-12 depend upon claim 8 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

**C. Claims 13-18**

Independent claim 13 as amended recites “dynamically calculate a relationship between input data to be received from the input device and the tactile sensation, at the time that the dynamically generated display screen data is sent to the display device, in accordance with (1) the dynamically generated display screen data defining the variable arrangement of the display elements within the variable screen layout and (2) object attribute data defining different tactile sensation force patterns for each display element within the variable screen layout based upon respective types of display elements.”

For the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 8, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 13 has been overcome. Claims 14-18 depend upon claim 13 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

**D. Claims 19-20**

Independent claim 19 as amended recites “dynamically calculate a relationship between input data to be received from the input device and the tactile sensation, at the time that the dynamically generated screen definition data is sent to the display device, in accordance with (1) the dynamically generated screen definition data defining the variable arrangement of all of the display elements and (2) object attribute data defining different tactile sensation force patterns for each display element within the dynamically generated screen definition data based upon respective types of display elements.”

For the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 8, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 19 has been overcome. Claim 20 depends upon claim 19 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

## SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the Application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Le Duc/

Timothy J. Le Duc  
Registration No. 54,745  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200

Dated: March 24, 2008